

JUL 31 2009

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK  
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>SUN HEE YOO; YOUNG WOO SUH,</p> <p>Petitioners,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p>Respondent.</p>
--

No. 06-72721

Agency Nos. A071-953-076  
A072-963-093

MEMORANDUM\*

On Petition for Review of an Order of the  
Board of Immigration Appeals

Submitted July 29, 2009\*\*

Before: WALLACE, LEAVY, and HAWKINS, Circuit Judges.

Sun Hee Yoo and her son, Young Woo Suh, natives and citizens of South Korea, petition for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' order dismissing

---

\* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

\*\* The panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without oral argument. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

their appeal from an immigration judge's order of removal. We have jurisdiction pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1252, and we deny the petition.

We reject petitioners' contention that the government failed to establish removability by clear and convincing evidence, because petitioners conceded removability. *See Shin v. Mukasey*, 547 F.3d 1019, 1024 (9th Cir. 2008).

We also reject petitioners' contention that the government should be equitably estopped from ordering their removal. Although a government employee, Leland Sustaire, issued Yoo's fraudulent alien registration card (Suh was a derivative beneficiary), the record shows Yoo was not "ignorant of the true facts" when she procured the card, *id.* at 1025, and, "[i]n any event, estoppel against the government is unavailable where petitioners have not lost any rights to which they were entitled." *Sulit v. Schiltgen*, 213 F.3d 449, 454 (9th Cir. 2000).

Finally, we find no defects amounting to a due process violation. *See Shin* at 1024-25; *Hong v. Mukasey*, 518 F.3d 1030, 1035-36 (9th Cir. 2008).

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**